

# DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 257 348

CG 018 928

**AUTHOR** Forrest, Linda; And Others  
**TITLE** The Elimination of Sexism in University Environments.  
**PUB DATE** Jun 84  
**NOTE** 37p.; Paper presented at the Annual Campus Ecology Symposium (2nd, Pingree Park, CO, June 25-29, 1984).  
**PUB TYPE** Reports - General (140) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)  
**EDRS PRICE** MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.  
**DESCRIPTORS** \*College Environment; College Students; \*Faculty Development; \*Females; Feminism; Higher Education; \*Sex Differences; \*Sex Discrimination; Sex Fairness; \*Student Development

## ABSTRACT

Sexism in educational institutions has limited women's careers, educational opportunities, and employment. Examples of this inequity include the facts that: (1) few women are chief executives in colleges; (2) women faculty earn less than men faculty; and (3) implicit and explicit attitudes such as the "old boy" network cause problems for women. Scholars have begun to re-examine theories of human development for deficiencies in male-produced theory. Feminist scholars have found current campus environments not conducive to female growth and development because of a lack of support for women students' goals and lifestyles. Women may be more sensitive to the ill effects of their environment than are men. A conducive environment for women would recognize intimacy, responsibility for others, and the quality of relationships. Campus organizations would emphasize open, dynamic structures rather than hierarchial ones. Rules would fit the individual and process would revolve around the ability to care for others. An ecosystem model for managing the campus environment would be designed to include valuing, goal setting, programming, fitting, mapping, observing, and feedback with women's needs as a structure. Campus environments can be redesigned to maximize growth and development for all students. (ABL)

\*\*\*\*\*  
 \* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made \*  
 \* from the original document. \*  
 \*\*\*\*\*

THE ELIMINATION OF SEXISM IN UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENTS

by

Linda Forrest, Ph.D.  
Associate Professor  
Counseling Center  
Michigan State University

Kathy Hotelling, Ph.D.  
Counseling Psychologist  
Counseling Center  
Southern Illinois University

Linda Kuk, Ph.D.  
Dean of Students  
Marquette University

For presentation to

Student Development Through Campus Ecology  
Second Annual Symposium  
June 25-29, 1984  
Pingree Park, Colorado

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION  
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION  
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS  
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

*Kathy Hotelling*

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

## THE ELIMINATION OF SEXISM IN UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENTS

At the second annual campus ecology symposium, addressing the topic of the elimination of sexism in university environments seems relevant, appropriate and timely. As Banning (1980) pointed out the campus ecology perspective has an "explicit value for promoting maximum personal growth" (p.212). Sexism in our educational institutions has limited women's careers, educational opportunities, and employment for years. To assist women in achieving their potential, these barriers must be addressed and reduced. Dissimilarities between males and females in their psychological development and socialization leads many women students to experience the educational climate in a harmful manner. For many women, the campus environment does not maximize their growth and development. This point will be substantiated with the presentation of the following information: 1) a description of the developmental differences between males and females, 2) a description of current campus environments and their effect on women's development, 3) a description of an "ideal" campus environment established to nurture and support women's development, and 4) suggestions for interventions on campuses to reduce sexism that incorporate an understanding of female development and "female" values.

### Points of Clarification

Elizabeth Tidball (1976, p.373) said: "Any attempt to 'prove' something about the climate of an institution or a group of institutions is bound to run into serious difficulties." With the spirit of this statement in mind, we offer four points of clarification for our presentation today.

First, although both men and women suffer from the negative consequences of institutional sexism, the focus of this paper is primarily on the price paid by women.

Second, the terms "male" values and "female" values are used throughout this discussion and refer to those values inherent in the "voices" which Gilligan (1982) so aptly describes in her book, In A Different Voice, and which will be summarized below.

Furthermore, because generalizations about a variety of issues will be made, exceptions to these generalizations can always be identified. The intention is not, however, to focus on the exceptions, because they are just that . . . exceptions; rather the emphasis will be on the normative patterns that characterize groups of females and groups of males and the environments in which they live.

Finally, popular definitions of sexism are often limited to statements about lack of equal opportunity. Consequently, strategies for eliminating sexism focus on the removal of discriminatory barriers, thus creating equal access for females to current environments. Broadening this typical view of sexism, the following discussion assumes that simply focusing on equal access only perpetuates current sexist environments; thus the exclusion of "female" values in current environments will be addressed and remedies offered.

#### Lack of Equal Access

A diversity of facts indicate the existence of lack of equal opportunity for females in today's institutions of higher education:

Out of 2,500 institutions surveyed, 148 had a female chief executive officer. In schools with enrollments over 10,000, this was true of only 4 institutions (Banning, 1983).

Women tend to take 2 to 10 years longer for promotion than their male colleagues (Banning, 1983).

Women make up 13% of college trustees and 8% of the trustees of four year coed colleges and universities (Banning, 1983).

The number of women in traditionally masculine fields continues to be very small (Banning, 1983).

And, in economic terms, the most blatant statistic may be that women earn \$.62 for every dollar earned by men in the United States. Men with eighth grade educations earn more than women with four years of college (Garland, 1983). The average faculty woman earns \$5,374 less than the average faculty man; the gap was only \$3,500 in 1977-78 ("Gap between salaries," 1983).

The above facts speak to the lack of equal opportunity component of sexism. However, perhaps the most damaging aspects of sexism in higher education are the differential treatment of males and females which occur everyday . . . "micro-inequities" as Mary Rowe (1977) calls them. These subtle and/or inadvertent incidents have such a damaging potential because they usually occur outside the conscious awareness of faculty or student. Additionally, they convey attitudes which promote the inclusion of "male" values and the exclusion of "female" values.

#### The Need for Environmental Changes

Sometimes these are difficult phenomena to identify and quantify, yet they have lasting ramifications. Such behavior is exemplified in the following quotes:

...have I been overtly discriminated against? Possibly no. Have I been encouraged, helped, congratulated, received recognitions, gotten a friendly hello, a solicitous 'can I help you out?' The answer is no. Being a woman here just makes you be tougher, work harder, and hope if you get a 4.0 GPA someone will say, 'you're good.' Perhaps like a fellow student told me, 'you're only here to get a husband.' If that were true, I can think of easier, less painful and discouraging ways (Heyman, 1977, p.64).

What I find damaging and disheartening are the underlying attitudes . . . the surprise I see when a woman does well in an exam - the condescending smile when she doesn't (Heyman, 1977, p.126).

I am even more ashamed to admit that out of my desire to be taken seriously as a physicist I was eager to avoid identification with other women students who I felt could not be taken seriously (Keller, 1977, p.86).

I have noticed that women tend to be much more tentative in seminars; often they will ask questions in lieu of making pronouncements. More often than not, their questions are treated with condescension, if they are not ignored entirely. I think male professors and graduate students will have to think seriously and openly about these more subtle, stylistic differences--about the perpetuation of the 'old boy' system in the classroom, as well as in the job market--before we can expect any major changes to occur (Heyman, 1977, p.90).

One of the greatest problems women faculty and students confront is how to be taken seriously in the daily life of colleges and universities. This problem has strong linguistic components since speech characteristics are often made into and evaluated as symbols of the person . . . The valued patterns of speech in college and university settings are more often found among men than among women speakers . . . (Thorne, 1979, p.5).

Because the campus ecology model recognizes the importance of the student - environment interaction, this model represents an excellent method to address the negative influences of the environment on female students exemplified by the above quotes, and the pressing need to make explicit and concerted efforts to change the learning and living environments of our universities.

The focus of concern can not be only on the women student to change; the process of change must also emanate from the environment. As Jerome Agel's work, Radical Therapist (1971), proposes, change not adjustment is needed to stop the perpetuation and legitimization of oppression. The transactional relationship between women students and the campus environment must be examined to understand how to overcome the attitude that the problem rests in the woman student if she doesn't adapt to the requirements of the academic environment. To begin this process, the developmental differences between females and males will be presented.

## II. Female Developmental As Normal and Positive

Several feminist scholars have begun to re-examine and re-evaluate established theories of human growth and development. Their goals are twofold: to search for deficiencies in the established theories and to propose new equitable approaches to human development.

The first step involves assessing the degree of inclusion of females in the development and articulation of the theory. If the degree of inclusion has been minimal, the next step is to develop studies to add an understanding of the female to the overall theory.

If the inclusion of females in the analysis has occurred, the feminist scholar assesses the presence and extent of negative attitudes toward women (..e., females as deficient, limited or underdeveloped). The scholar in the evaluation of current theory works to remove embedded and perhaps subtle negativism based on sex and develops a more equitable, positive, and comprehensive approach.

Nancy Chodorow exemplifies such an approach in her book, The Reproduction of Mothering (1978). She focuses on the early stages of development from the ages of 1-5 years and considers the crucial, differentiating experience in male and female development arises out of the fact that women are primarily responsible for the early child care and for the later socialization of females. She reiterates the fact that all children begin life in a state of dependence upon, in most cases, a mother. This leads to a primary identification with the mother and a strong attachment to her for both sexes.

In contrast to Freud, she believes the earliest experiences of separation (1-3 years) differ for boys and girls. Females experience themselves as like their female mothers and thus fuse the experience of attachment with the developing process of identity formation. Males, in differentiating themselves as opposite from their female mothers and masculine, separate their mothers from themselves as a sense of self develops

In establishing their gender identity beyond age 3, males and females continue to differ. A boy's masculine identification must replace the early primary identification with his mother. Identification with the more remote father is a "positional" one requiring the learning of narrow and specific role behaviors. A girl's feminine gender identification is with her mother and does not involve a rejection of early primary identification. Her identification is a "personal" one, continuous with her earliest feelings of attachment. Thus, feminine personality comes to define itself more in relation and connection to other people than masculine personality.



Since masculinity is defined through separation while femininity is defined through attachment, male gender identity is threatened by intimacy while female gender identity is threatened by separation. Thus, males tend to have difficulty with relationships, while females tend to have problems with individuation. (Gilligan, 1982, p.9)

With Chodorow's work female development is viewed as normal and positive but different from male development. Chodorow reminds us that traditional psychology sees the concept of empathy embedded in young girls' definition of self as a developmental liability, because the hurdles of childhood and adolescent development focus on and stress the importance of separation and individuation, not attachment and connection. Chodorow suggests indirectly through her work comparable questions for males: Are there also developmental liabilities to male development? Is there a definition of failure associated with males' lack of ability to sustain an attachment in their identity formation? And do these two distinct developmental progressions each have their own strengths and liabilities?

A developmental psychologist, Carol Gilligan (1982) in her work, In a Different Voice, suggests that the themes of separation and attachment resurface in adolescence in the form of identity and intimacy. Here again, Gilligan like Chodorow, finds that males and females' understanding and experience of the relationship between self and other differs. She states that "male and female voices typically have spoken of the importance of different truths, the male voices speak of the role of separation in development as it comes to define and empower the self, and the female voices speak of the ongoing process of attachment that creates and sustains the human community" (Gilligan, 1980, p.18). In three studies of youth and young adults' identity and moral development, Gilligan delineates developmental perspectives of each sex and extrapolates a theory of development which creates a positive and direct approach for

both sexes suggesting that each holds part of the overall truth and that as individuals pass into young adulthood, they discover the limitations of their current developmental path and open to the possibility of the other's truth.

Based on women's self descriptions, a fusion of identity and intimacy is clearly articulated. In all of the women's self descriptions, identity is defined in the context of relationships and judged by a standard of responsibility and care. Consistently, the women use terms like giving, helping, caring, being kind and not hurting others as illustrated by the following self descriptions.

... I think maternal, with all of its connotations. I see myself in a nurturing role, maybe not right now, but whenever that might be, as a physician, as a mother...It's hard for me to think of myself without thinking about other people around me that I'm giving to (p.158).

I am fairly hard-working and fairly thorough and fairly responsible and in terms of weaknesses, I am sometimes hesitant about making decisions and unsure of myself...The other very important aspect of my life is my husband and trying to make his life easier and trying to help him out (p.158)

...I am intense. I am warm. I am smart about people...I have a lot more soft feelings than hard feelings. I am a lot easier to get to be kind than to get mad...(p.158)

All of these women have pursued graduate educations and are working as highly successful professional women, yet they do not mention their academic and professional distinctions in describing themselves. In fact, upon further investigation, many of their statements suggest conflict between achievement and care.

For men, the tone of identity is clearer, more distinct and direct than that of the

women. Men's self descriptions connote separation by categorizing themselves as intelligent, logical, creative, and honest, thus, in a sense creating a non-relationship to define one's individual identity. Men describe themselves as different from others in order to illustrate and underline their identities. Perhaps, it is more what they do not say than what they do say in the following examples that creates this sense of separation.

Logical, compromising, outwardly calm. It seems like my statements are short and abrupt, it is because of my background and training. Architectural statements have to be very concise and short...I consider myself educated, reasonably intelligent (p.161).

I would describe myself as an enthusiastic, passionate person who is slightly arrogant. Concerned, committed ... (p.161).

I would describe myself as a person who is well developed intellectually and emotionally... And relatively proud of the intellectual skills and development, content with the emotional developments as such, as a not very actively pursued goal. Desiring to broaden that one, the emotional aspect (p.161).

Intelligent, perceptive — I am being brutally honest now — still somewhat reserved, unrealistic about a number of social situations which involve people, particularly authorities. A little dilettantish, interested in a lot of things without necessarily going into them in depth, although I am moving toward correcting that (p. 161).

Thus, it appears that instead of attachment, individual achievement and separate identity in the male focuses and defines his standard of assessment and sense of success. Men's descriptions of self through others appears as a qualification (or secondary component) of self, rather than an aspect of its realization. With the above differences defined, the sequential ordering of identity and intimacy described by Erikson appears valid for men, but not for women. Gilligan believes for men that

intimacy becomes the critical experience that brings self back into connection with others, generating a more complete sense of identity. For women, identity and intimacy are fused from an early age and the critical experience is one of separating the self from others so that one is aware of responsibility to self as well as to others. Therefore, in the transition from adolescence to adulthood, both sexes experience a conflict between personal rights and care. However, men and women start from different ideological positions in wrestling with the dilemma: Men from separation, which is justified by an ethic of rights, and women from attachment, which is supported by an ethic of care.

In women's development, the absolute of care, defined initially as not hurting others, becomes complicated through the recognition of the need for personal meaning and responsibility to self. This gives rise to the claim of equality of attention to self and others, which changes the understanding of relationships and transforms the definition of care. At the same time, the absolutes of logic, justice and fairness, which connote no fluidity or connection to others, are gradually called into question by men through experiences that demonstrate the existence of differences between self and others. These differences appear irresolvable when care is incorporated into their concept of established principles. The awareness of multiple truths coming from an increased understanding of intimacy gives rise to a redefinition of equality which begins to include a concept of care and compassion. Initially for males, relationships are subordinate to rules and rules are subordinate to moral principles. However, intimacy with people calls this ordering into question. Thus, what males initially see as competing rights of individuals to be resolved by rules and moral principles, females see as conflicting responsibilities to, to be resolved by improving one's ability to care.

Ideally, the divergence in judgment between the sexes moves in the direction of convergence through the discovery by each of the other's perspective and the interrelationship between moral principles and care. According to Gilligan, the discovery of this complementarity of the two different approaches is the discovery of maturity and integrity. However, studies of adult male development across the life span suggest that many of the highly successful and achieving men have a noticeable lack of friendship and intimacy in their lives, appear "compromised in their capacity for intimacy, and live at great personal distance from others" (p.155). Levinson's Seasons of a Man's Life (1978), Valliant's Adaptation to Life (1977) and Erikson's accounts of Luther in A Young Man Luther (1958) and Gandhi's life in Gandhi's Truth (1974) all seem to suggest these limitations of male development.

At the same time, achieving women often attempt to maintain extremely high standards for both their career and their relationships leading to the superwoman phenomenon which can create emotional and physical signs of overload. Still other women adopt the "male" model (removing the strain of having to excell in all categories) and take on the qualities and values of the dominant system. Often these women progress quickly in the hierarchical structure, because they do not challenge the established values of the system.

In summary, developmental psychologists have neglected to describe the value of intimacy, relationships, and care because they have been male researchers influenced by their own male development, by studying male subjects, and by treating those who do not fit into their framework as limited or underdeveloped. In describing human development they have focused on the development of self within the context of work,

thus devaluing the major ways women define themselves.

But this construction reveals a limitation which measures women's development against a male standard and ignores the possibility of a different truth...The observation that women's embeddedness in the lives of relationships, their orientation to interdependence, their subordination of achievement to care, and their conflicts with competitive success leave them personally at risk in mid-life, seems more a commentary on the society than a problem in women's development (p.171).

A broad consequence of this theoretical and research bias is a vision of adulthood and maturity that is out of balance, favoring separateness over connection, and leaning more toward an autonomous life of work than toward the interdependence of love and care.

#### ✓ Current Campus Environments

Having described the developmental progressions of males and females as articulated by feminist scholars, the second aspect of this analysis is the examination of current academic environments. Many individuals have written about environmental conditions and their effect on individuals: Jo Freeman (1979) speaks of "null environment" in higher education, Mischel (1976) of the "power" of the environment, Anne Wilson Schaef (1981), Tidball (1976), and others of male systems and male models. The consensus which emerges from the perspectives which will now be presented is that current environments are not conducive to female growth and development because they exclude an understanding and appreciation of female development and values.

Jo Freeman<sup>o</sup> postulates that academia is a "null environment" (1979). That is,

an academic situation that neither encourages nor discourages students of either sex is inherently discriminatory against women because it fails to take into account the differentiating external environments from which women and men students come (p.21).

According to this viewpoint, professionals in higher education do not have to do anything to discourage women since society already does so. Failing to encourage them, however, is to discriminate without even trying. Women enter higher education with a handicap which the null environment does nothing to decrease and may actually reinforce.

Validity for this perspective is observed in a study completed at the University of Chicago. Freeman (1979) found that the weakest support for careers and attendance in graduate/professional schools came from faculty for both males and females; this was evidenced by the low percentage of students who felt that faculty were noticeably ~~un~~favorable to their pursuit of education/careers and the very high percentage of students who answered "I don't know" to how faculty felt about the students' choices. In addition, 43-93% of men and women responded that not a single faculty member ever expressed an opinion or implied one on matters regarding a student's seriousness, academic progress, suitability for field of work, and intellectual ability. Thus, it appears that higher education may in fact be a null environment.

Yet, the overall picture is more sterile for women than for men. The number of "don't know" responses show not only low levels of support for women, but also that women

don't get enough feedback from their environment. This discouragement is insidious: it fails to respond in any way.

As Freeman says:

At least overt negative responses provide women with some interaction and some standards by which they can judge their behavior. It also creates a challenge - something to be overcome. If women are conscious of the roadblocks . . . they are in better position to muster the energy to struggle against them (1979, p.231).

This "discouragement by default" (Freeman, 1979, p.227) is shown in various ways other than by lack of faculty backing. It is exhibited in the structure of the university which gears itself to meet the needs of men and those women whose lives are most similar to men's.

Because of the reality that women in higher education have lifestyles which are extremely diverse, women don't fit as comfortably into university environments as do men. For example, more and more women students have children, yet few universities provide adequate day and night child care facilities to afford these students the opportunity to participate fully in the educational process. While many male students also have children, more often than not they also have a wife who cares for their children or who shares in the care. Students who are single parents tend to be women, not men.

A very clear example of how what is good for men is not necessarily the same for women is given by the question in the Freeman study regarding the effect of children



on students' academic work. Fifteen percent of the women and one percent of the men said their children had a very unfavorable effect, while sixteen percent of the men and zero percent of the women said their children had a very favorable effect. Creating and managing a university environment in terms of male standards of need does not meet the needs of women students adequately.

Yet we all know that meeting the needs of students who are different is not new. We arrange for loans, scholarships, etc., for students with limited incomes. We provide health services (sometimes not gynecologists) for students who are ill. Specialized services are offered to handicapped students, minority students and others. Yet, often more attention is paid to the special needs of men (i.e., those returning from combat) than those of women (i.e., those finding themselves pregnant).

The powerful effect of this "null environment" can be seen even more clearly if one examines Mischel's (1976) interactionist conceptualization of the greater or lesser unitary effects of environments on individuals.

Mischel proposed that psychological situations are powerful to the extent that they influence everyone to perceive particular events the same way, "induce uniform expectancies regarding the most appropriate response pattern, provide adequate incentives for the performance of that response pattern, and require skills that everyone has to the same extent" (p.507). An example of a powerful stimulus is a red traffic light of which most drivers know the meaning, are motivated to obey, and know how to stop when they see it.

On the other hand, situations are weak to the degree that they don't generate the same perceptions of an event, uniform expectancies for a response, adequate incentives for this response, nor skills that everyone has. Thus, a projective test would be an extreme example of a weak environmental stimulus.

What this means is that more individual differences will be observed when the situation is ambiguous than structured: for example, the wide range of answers on a projective test. Situational effects are minimal. Conversely, when the situation is powerful, as in the example of the red traffic light, individual differences are minimal and situational effects dominant.

Thus, going back to the woman student who received little or no feedback from her environment, we can predict that situational variables will be weak and person variables dominant in this environment. Applying the developmental concepts of Chodorow and Gilligan, we can imagine a woman student experiencing stronger effects from the "null environment" because of the importance she places on relationships with others. Because her identity is defined in the context of relationships, she is most comfortable in web-like environments and is attuned to the needs of others. Yet in the college setting, she finds herself in a situation where the relationship is basically nonexistent and she isn't sure of what others expect of her due to the lack of communication. She is threatened by this lack of connection and her self-esteem may well plummet. The impact of this chain of situational variables and psychological events is that the woman student finds herself ambivalent, at best, concerning the choices she has made in terms of career and education. Her achievement strivings may be inhibited if she perceives success as a potential loss of a relationship or if success

entails another's failure. She may not feel worthwhile because her sense of strength comes from intimacy and support from others. In essence the support which she rightly perceives as lacking from others in the academic environment exerts a powerful influence on her self-perception, her ability to cope with the current situation and her progression toward her career goals.

Thus, not only looking at the phenomena from a theoretical/conceptual base, but also from an empirical and experiential bases, it is not surprising to read the conclusion of Hearn and Olzak (1982):

There is persuasive evidence that, in selecting and reacting to educational environments, females tend more than males to be attuned to the personal supportiveness of these environments (pp.6-7).

According to an analysis of data collected by the American Council on Education (Tidball, 1976), virtually all educational environments are male oriented and male dominated. This was not assumed solely on the basis that male faculty outnumber female faculty, but on data illustrating substantial difference between men and women, regardless of institutional affiliations, with respect to issues that affect the climates of all institutions of higher education. For example, it was found that most male faculty are relatively insensitive to issues affecting women students and colleagues. "Although there is a high degree of same-sex bonding indicated by the responses, the proportion of women faculty in most institutional settings is so small that their opinions count for only a very small increment of the total institutional opinion" (p.378); the only exception to this is the women's colleges. Thus, the predominating environmental tone is determined by male faculty and their value systems.

Using the paradigm developed by Blocher (1978) we believe that the opportunity subsystems, support subsystems, and reward subsystems in educational environments do not operate to positively shape the educational experience of women. This is further illustrated by two concepts introduced by Banning (1980) as phenomena related to the failure of universities to address broader change strategies in fitting with a campus ecology perspective: in loco parentis and the medical model. In addition to being individualistic approaches, these concepts both have the underpinnings of "male" values.

The traditional guiding concept of the treatment of students, in loco parentis, has been manifested in sex biased manner. In the past, the practices of restricting hours varied from campus to campus but the intent to control female movement was clear. Female students had "hours" while males were given free rein over their night time activities. A limited number of "pink slips" were allocated each semester; these gave females an extra hour out on special occasions, but they could also be taken away if one returned to the dorm even five minutes late. Remnants of in loco parentis are still subtly with us, as are the inherent gender biases of that system. For example, some college campuses ban the display and/or distribution of contraceptive devices (If we talk about "it", they'll do it.), yet the female student is the one punished: she bears the burden, often alone, of pregnancy.

The second phenomena which Banning broaches as an individualistic perspective is the medical model which concerns itself with diagnosis and the deviancy of the individual as defined by an expert and authority. Women have been labeled as deviant, undeveloped or mentally ill requiring treatment, when they did not conform to societal expectations of the proper role for females (Broverman et al., 1972).

For an example, Thomas and Stewart (1971) studied career counselors attitudes toward female clients' vocational choices. Counselors of both sexes perceived female clients' career choices in traditionally male fields as more deviant and less appropriate than female clients who selected careers in traditional female fields. Thus, their work suggests an attitude of deviance toward females who do not conform to traditional societal expectations of females. Even of more concern, however, is their finding that these same counselors perceived these "deviant" female clients as needing more counseling to better understand themselves and to reevaluate their career choice than the more "conforming" female clients.

These models of learning, of restraint, and of pathology have advanced the environments of our campuses as discriminatory in concrete, day-to-day practices which affect opportunity. But they also have had a profound effect on the devaluation of females values of intimacy, relationships, care, and responsibility. This devaluation shakes the very foundation of the female personality structure as described by Chodorow and Gilligan and often results in long-range developmental deficits in self-esteem which not only influence personal relationships but also professional opportunities and risks ventured by the woman later in life.

This devaluation of female values is manifested by a system of doing and producing (linear thinking, rationality, objectivity, orderliness, and impersonality) and are exemplified in the priorities of our institutions (Schaefer, 1981).

The setting and maintaining of boundaries, through organizational flow charts; the institution of single leaders and the resulting emphasis on power and control; the deliberate institution of sameness of ideas and people, and

its assurance of suppression of conflict or difference—all these behaviors come from overemphasis and dependence on masculine qualities and denial or suppression of the feminine qualities.

Student affairs is, in a sense, the bridge between the masculine world of academia and the feminine personality of the woman student. As student affairs professionals, we are attending to the traditionally feminine and nurturing functions, yet within an organizational paradigm of orderliness, rationality, power, and control (Fried, 1979). Crookston (Fried, 1979) maintains that bureaucracy is contradevelopmental because it demands and rewards conformity, control, stability, and predictability, while student development thrives on creativity, flexibility, innovativeness, and equalitarianism. The challenge for us as educators then is to change the campus environment so that both male and female students may experience the beneficial effects of both the female and male models. Having analyzed the environment in which most of us work, we must now turn to the environment which would be ideal for the female student.

#### An Ideal Environment for Women

What would our campus environments look like if they were designed to fit and nurture female development? Can we hypothesize some environmental, organizational and interpersonal interactions which would feel comfortable, create opportunities, and provide support and rewards for female development as described by Chodorow and Gulligan? Based on the importance females place on attachment and care that "sustains the human community", what organizational structures, procedures, and policies would best represent this developmental perspective? Anne Wilson Schaef (1981) in her work,

Women's Reality, attempts to describe a women's environment: a culture or system based on females who accept the developmental process which values highly intimacy, the ethic of responsibility and care for others, and attention to the quality and ongoingness of relationships. The following positive example of such an environment is based on her descriptions in chapter five of Women's Reality. However the organization, labeling and ordering of the factors she presents have been altered for this discussion.

Structurally, our campuses would be organized to emphasize open, creative, dynamic, and multi-dimensional possibilities. Organizations would not have established hierarchial structures, nor would there be clearly defined rules and regulations for operating. The structure would emerge and evolve as individuals work together. In all likelihood, the structure would change as individuals joined and left the organization. The structure would allow for equal-to-equal relationships where the individual could base her interaction with others on the promise or hope for equality. If an unequal, hierarchical relationship exists due to role responsibilities, efforts would be made to bridge the inequality when acting outside the role, rather than sustaining the role differential in a setting where the role was no longer necessary. In our interactions there would be a lack of assessment of individuals based on rank, power, or authority. Assessment of individuals would be based on the quality of care and understanding in the relationship.

The structure of our organizations and interactions among our members would be based on the concepts of sharing resources, information, space, and money. Individuals would use personal power to accomplish good for self and others rather than power over others or to control others. Responsibility would be measured on the ability to respond

rather than on an accountability and the potential for establishing blame. Rules would be viewed as flexible and developed by the people involved and affected by the circumstances. The purpose of rules that did exist would be to increase freedom and creativity. If a rule did not make sense it would be altered or eliminated to better fit the needs of the individuals involved. All affected individuals would be encouraged to be involved in making the new rule. Individuals and their relationships would be primary, whereas rules and principles of justice and the rights of individuals would be viewed as secondary.

The process would evolve around the ability to care and respond to others, in knowing another and being known, and in the ability to draw out people's true thoughts, feelings, and diverse opinions. Logic would be used to explore problems rather than control problems. Feelings are considered a crucial part of the whole process. Meaningful interpersonal relationships are based on the ability to stay connected even in the face of strong emotion and disagreement. Honesty would be seen as an opening to possibilities, the potential for better solutions and better relationships rather than as vulnerability, danger, and to be avoided except in meted out segments.

Leadership would be viewed as facilitating others (nudging people from behind or from the side) and open to criticism. Leadership would better be described as participating rather than instructing and directing.

The focus would be on the quality of the process. The actual, measured outcomes would be viewed as important, yet secondary to the quality of interactions and the establishment of trusting, well-functioning relationships. Thus, tasks would be



dependent upon and accomplished as a result of good working relationships.

Collective decision making would be based on drawing individuals out, uncovering underlying conflict, and recognizing the consequences of various decisions on individuals rather than on majority rule and minority adjust or adapt. The collective process of decision making would be as important as the decision itself.

Individuals would work to avoid a process that created direct competition among individuals and consequently the potential for some individuals to experience a sense of loss or failure. Competition, if it existed, would be indirect. One would compete against one's self to improve and not against others. One's gain would be seen as an ultimate gain for all.

Individuals would seek to view situations in large, wholistic ways hoping to breakdown barriers between individuals and categories of distinction or separation. The individuals and organizations would be based on the merging of boundaries between units (e.g., work and home, professor and student, student affairs and academic departments).

Because the quality of relationships is tantamount, the concept of time would be in the "here and now" and short term oriented rather than long term and futuristic. The allotment of time would be based on the requirements of the individuals and the betterment of the relationships rather than on the potential products or outcome. Time would be viewed as endless; one continues to communicate to resolve disputes or conflicts together. Individuals would see themselves as needing to stay open and flexible in relationship to time, in order to be responsive to others rather than being

bound by time or wanting to control time to accomplish tasks, produce products and plan for the future.

In summary the environment created to best fit the female would be structured in a flexible, adaptable manner to be ultimately responsive to the people variables and people interactions. The rewards in such an environment would be based on developing the quality of the interactions among the individuals. The emphasis would be on evolving, emerging, and discovering self and others and the potential for more satisfying relationships.

This description of an "ideal" campus environment to nurture and sustain female development is created as a juxtaposition to current campus environments. Schaefer (1981) emphasizes the fact that each environment suggests certain strengths and limitations, and that neither environment is necessarily better than the other. If we examine carefully the ideal environment for female development we can begin to understand how non-receptive our current campus environments are for our female students, staff and faculty. Thus, equal access to opportunities in our current campus environments is not sufficient to eliminate sexism.

#### Application of Theories - The Ecological Model

If the college campus is to become an environment that promotes maximum growth and development for all, environments need to be designed to allow for the emergence and co-existence of the "female" value system. As Blocher (1978) points out:

there is increasing evidence that developmental processes are not automatic, but must be purposefully triggered and carefully nurtured by the environment if full growth and development is to be reached (Banning, 1980, p.217).

The ecosystem model is a perspective which provides a methodology to design and manage the campus environment (Banning, 1980). The concept of campus ecology seeks to ensure that a campus environment encourages maximum growth and development of all students. The ecological perspective includes the total ecology, the student, the environment, and most importantly the transactional relationship between the two (Banning, 1980). With a few modifications, this model is ideally adaptive to redesigning our college campuses so they represent multi-value environments supportive of both male and females.

The systematic way of viewing the campus is termed the ecosystem design process. The seven basic steps in the process are as follows:

1. Valuing - Designers, in conjunction with community members, select educational values
2. Goal Setting - Values are then translated into specific goals
3. Programming - Environments are designed that contain mechanisms to reach the stated goals
4. Fitting - Environments are fitted to students
5. Mapping - Students' perceptions of the environment are measured
6. Observing - Student behavior resulting from environmental perceptions is monitored
7. Feedback - Data on the environmental design's success and failure ... are fed back to the designers...

Banning (1980) suggests that the steps in utilizing this design process are interdependent, so planning intervention on a campus can begin at any of the steps. He

postulates that if a campus is in the process of being constructed, it would begin with step one (1) and in the case of an established institution at step five (5).

In considering the situation where the model is utilized to redesign a campus environment to reflect the integration of both the male and female systems of values, a pre-step, labeled Awareness, needs to occur.

The designer must first create a climate where there is an "Awareness" of the existence of alternate value systems. Given the current dominance of "male" values within our culture and as a result, on the college campus, students will not identify and select values more associated with female development without some experience which creates an awareness of the benefits of this perspective. In addition, students may be less likely to identify potential limitations or weaknesses of the dominant values currently present on many campuses. Any efforts toward integrating the male and female values on college campuses will not occur until a collective awareness is established in our students, faculty and staff.

An example that will illustrate this point can be observed by examining the structure and operations of the majority of student government bodies within our institutions. The structures are modeled after our federal system and reflect a fairly rigid, highly delineated set of responsibilities for each specific branch. The procedures are governed by a very elaborate set of parliamentary rules and a majority decision-making process. Individuals are either elected or appointed to office for a specific period of time.

No one raises questions or proposes alternative structural arrangements for these governing bodies. In one case, a women's organization decided that they wanted to

govern collectively with the responsibility for the organization rotating among the membership. The student organizational approving body would not recognize them as an "official" organization unless they designated a president and officers. These student leaders could not comprehend nor accept the notion that there are alternative governing structure that do not reflect the values of the predominant system.

Another example of the overwhelming influence of the "male" values on our campuses is reflected in the proliferation over the past ten years of highly complex, legalistic judicial processes on most college campuses. These procedures stress individual rights and due process and although not tied to the court system, often operate as a "looking glass" image of such. These judicial systems do not appear to incorporate "female" values and modes of interaction into their structure and procedures (e.g., the concept of embeddedness in relationships).

These and countless other examples illustrate an acceptance of the established value system and a lack of recognition of other value systems and their benefits. One cannot begin to realistically evaluate or redesign a value system for an environment if the environment is engulfed in the myths that it already possesses and exemplifies the "only true and right" values and that these are superior to any others. So how does a designer go about unraveling this dilemma?

Rosabeth Moss Kanter in her book Change Masters (1983) has provided a model for innovation and change that could prove useful for the environmental designer to adapt to "prime" the campus for integration of the "female" value system with the pre-existing "male" value system.

Kanter suggests initial education and support building as crucial elements in creating change and encouraging innovation. This involves identifying sources of support and developing information and mechanisms to persuade individuals to become involved in the innovations.

First, the designer needs to identify existing resources within the institution that might serve as models and change agents for creating awareness, for challenging values and facilitating the redesign of educational values that incorporates an understanding of female development. Within the current college environment the student affairs staff may provide this resource. As Fried (1983) pointed out:

The flaw in our professional thinking and our approach to student development education is in assuming that development - cognitive, moral, emotional - is gender blind, and that one pattern applies to all. It seems appropriate that people who are involved in student development education or student affairs administration begin to move toward training models and educational approaches which acknowledge gender-based differences and allow individuals to make judgments using their own natural modes of thought. The ultimate goal for training and policy should be to help individuals learn the mode which is not their 'nature language' so that they can move beyond stereotypic gender differences and become more fully functioning individuals.

Some of our student affairs staff members already possess a multi-system awareness and androgynous characteristics which make them ideally "suited" to take leadership roles in building bridges that link the two value systems.

"Key staff" who possess the versatility to readily learn a "new" language and culture can be placed in position to initially interpret, then model and finally teach others.

Once individuals with these attributes are identified, they can participate in staff development programs aimed at heightening multi-systems awareness and developing environmental intervention skills.

Second, the designer must identify the motivating factors that allow individuals to accept the emergence and co-existence of "male" and "female" value systems. One might speculate that for women and for some men an incentive might be that they can explore aspects and abilities in their "natures" that they never allowed to emerge or that they never realize existed. For other men, it might well be the relief that they will not have to face the isolation associated with identity solidification which required separation from others. For other men and women, it may be the realization that the awakening to other systems creates avenues of communication between individuals, the sexes and their cultural framework that ultimately could result in a new level of harmony for "humankind".

Third, the designer needs to plan and develop education strategies that will create an awareness of the need for the traditional and accepted "male" values to co-exist with the "female" values. These strategies would incorporate motivational factors with factual information, values exploration and gender role discussion to maximize an individual's own awareness as well as gain their willingness to participate in future ecosystem design efforts. In integrating these educational efforts within the organizational environment the designer must always stay flexibly tuned to situations, issues and opportunities that may spontaneously present themselves. Such situations can serve as catalysts in stepping up and intensifying the awareness process.



An illustration of such a situation occurred recently on a campus where a series of seemingly unrelated incidents occurred. These incidents included a rape in a residence hall, a series of fourth degree sexual assaults by male students against female students and a highly publicized encounter between male residence hall students and local community people during a "Take Back the Night" march. Initially, the university responded to each incident in its rather isolated routine format. However, a group of staff and students "seized the moment" and through careful information gathering and presentation, they tied the incidents together, revealing a systematic problem within the university related to gender role development and human relationship education. Through grass roots persistence they were able to gain programmatic and financial support from all areas of student affairs. With the backing of the vice president of student affairs, they began to address these issues with developmental programs. These efforts gained substantial media coverage, some of it controversial. This experience, heightened by student and staff discussion, convinced the staff development committee to focus on gender role issues and the campus environment as the spring workshop theme. As a result, the various student affairs areas have made a commitment to these issues systematically within their student affairs area. Had the ingenious notion to portray the unobvious link not presented itself it is unlikely that the trust and response to "awareness" would have come about in such a contagious and expedient manner.

Regardless if the awareness program is stimulated by a situational catalyst or is slow and methodical, in all cases, the institutional tools are needed to focus on creating incentives that will encourage individuals to participate. Kanter also stresses participation as a critical factor. Successful change is unlikely unless it is communicated thoroughly and supported in a broad based fashion (Kanter, 1983).



As the design team moves through the ecosystem design process, care needs to be taken to fuse the "female" value system into the model at every step. For example, at the goal setting step, the "female" value of commitment to the process may influence the methods used to derive the goal statement as well as the actual content of the goals (e.g., goal statements which direct attention to the development and progression of relationships rather than attention to products and measurable outcomes).

Another example, this one at the mapping step, is that current available instruments for measuring students' perceptions of their environment may not include content questions addressing areas pertinent to female growth and development (e.g., career planning questions which do not recognize the embeddedness of relationship and the contextual meanings women prize in their career-life planning). Gilligan would also suggest the methods used need to be altered to gather information about women's perceptions, because women's voices have been so silenced by the traditional studies of human development. She appeals to researchers to approach females themselves with open-ended, exploratory questions which allow women to talk freely of their experiences and their understanding of their experiences. She cautions the researchers to leave behind old assumptions and listen carefully for new meanings and frameworks from which to understand female development (Gilligan, 1984).

A final example comes from the observing step. Traditional methods of observation have encouraged objectivity, detachment, a "blind" observer uninfluenced by the objectives of the researcher, and control of the variables associated with observation (e.g., the potential bias of the observer). However, new methods of observation (e.g., participant observation, ethnographic methods) suggest a different understanding of

subjectivity, participation by the observer, the importance of establishing and maintaining a relationship with the one being observed. All of these methods suggest the importance of considering "female" values in the decisions about observation methodology. Not only does the design team need to be cautious in including methods which are more conducive to female growth and development, but the actual content of what and who are observed needs to be examined to guarantee inclusion of activities associated with "female" values and development.

Thus, care must be taken to make sure that the instruments, observations and interpretation process reflect an integration of both the male and female systems. Awareness to use of language, sex biased assumptions, and unquestioning adherence to male cultural norms could drastically influence both the responses and interpretation of the feedback process. With culturally unbiased monitoring processes actively in place, the ongoing application of the redesign model could be maintained as a channel to keep the environment responsive to student-environment fit.

As students and faculty become more aware and adaptive to the existence of the female value system, the "fitting" process would become more of an interchange between the individual and the environment. A type of "symbiosis" might develop where the emphasis shifts from control and mastering of the environment to one of harmony and balance with it.

Time and space permitting, the application of this model within the college campus environment could be expanded. Every aspect of the environment could benefit from a thorough analysis utilizing the theory and process presented here. The adaptation of

the ecodesign model fused with the integration of the male and female values and attributes could serve as a viable approach to redesigning the campus environment to maximize growth and development for all students!

## References

- Agel, J. (1971). Radical Therapist. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Baker-Miller, Jean (1976). Toward a New Psychology of Women. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Banning, J.H. (1980). The campus ecology manager role. In U. Delworth, G.R. Hanson, & Associates, (Eds.), Student services: A handbook for the profession (pp.209-227). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Banning, J.H. (1983, October). The environmental conditions of racism and sexism: A challenge for campus counseling centers. Paper presented at the meeting of the Association of University and College Counseling Center Directors, Colorado Springs, Co.
- Blocher, D.H. (1977). The Counselor's Impact on Learning Environments. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 55, (6) pp. 352-355.
- Blocher, D.H. (1978). Campus learning environments and the ecology of student development. Campus ecology: A perspective for student affairs. Cincinnati, OH: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.
- Broverman, I.K., Vogel, S., Broverman, D., Clarkson, F., and Rosenkrantz, P. (1972). Sex stereotypes: A current appraisal. Journal of Social Issues. 28:59-79.
- Chodorow, Nancy (1978). The Reproduction of Mothering. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Erikson, Erik H. (1958). Young Man Luther. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Erikson, Erik H. (1974). Gandhi's Truth. New York: W.W. Horton.
- Freeman, J. (1979). How to discriminate against women without really trying. In J. Freeman (Ed.), Women: A feminist perspective (pp.217-232). Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield
- Fried, J. (1979, March). Consciousness raising: A feminist analysis of student development education. Paper presented at the meeting of the American College Personnel Association, Los Angeles, CA.
- Fried, J. (1983). Rights, Responsibilities and Caring. Developments Newsletter, American College Personnel Association.
- Staff. (1983, Fall). Gap between salaries for men and women faculty continues to grow. Status News, p.3.
- Garland, S.B. (1983, November). Working women: It still doesn't pay to be female. St. Louis Globe Democrat.
- Gilligan, Carol (1980). Restoring the missing text of women's development to life cycle theories. In D. McGuigan (Ed.), Women's Lives: New Theory, Research and Policy. Ann Arbor: Center for Continuing Education of Women.
- Gilligan, Carol (1982). In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Gilligan, Carol (1982). Why should a woman be more like a man. Psychology Today, 16(6): 68-77.
- Gilligan, Carol (1984). Women's development: New perspectives on education. Presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors, Boston.
- Hearn, J.D., & Olzak, S. (1982). The role of college major departments in the reproduction of sexual inequality. Iowa City, IA: The American College Testing Program.
- Heyman, I.M. (1977). Women students at Berkeley: Views and data on possible sex discrimination in academic programs. Unpublished manuscript, University of California-Berkeley, Office of Chancellor.
- Kanter, Rosabeth (1983). Change masters: Innovations for productivity in the American corporation. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Keller, E.F. (1977). The anomaly of a woman in physics. In S. Ruddick & P. Daniels, (Eds.), Working It Out (pp.77-91). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Levinson, Daniel J. (1978). The Season's of a Man's Life. New York: Knopf.
- Mischel, W. (1976). Introduction to personality (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Projects on the Status and Education of Women. (1982). The classroom climate: A chilly one for women? Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges.
- Rowe, M.P. (1977). The Saturns' rings phenomenon: Micro-inequities and unequal opportunity in the American economy. In P. Bourne & V. Parness (Eds.), Proceedings of the National Science Foundation Conference on Women's Leadership and Authority. Santa Cruz, CA: University of California
- Schaeff, Anne Wilson (1981). Women's Reality - An Emerging Female System in the White Male Society. Minneapolis, MN: Winston Press.
- Thomas, A.H. and Stewart, N.R. (1971). Counselor response to female clients with deviate and conforming career goals. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 18:352-357
- Thorne, B. (1979, September). Claiming verbal space: Women speech and language in college classrooms. Paper presented at the Research Conference on Educational Environments and the Undergraduate Woman, Wellesley, MA.
- Tidball, E.M. (1976). Of Men and research: The dominant themes in American higher education include neither teaching nor women. Journal of Higher Education, 47:373-389
- Vaillant, George E. (1977). Adaptations To Life. Boston: Little, Brown.